



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,145	02/07/2002	Guy E. Averett	ONS00317	1448

7590 08/16/2006

ON Semiconductor
Patent Administration Dept - MD A700
P.O. Box 62890
Phoenix, AZ 85082-2890

EXAMINER

NADAV, ORI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2811

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/072,145	AVERETT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ori Nadav	2811	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-10, 26, 27, 29, 32 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5-10, 26, 27, 29, 32 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 and 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claimed limitations of at least a portion of the semiconductor (cap) layer is configured to convert to a semiconductor oxide that covers the first opening while leaving a void in the second recessed region when the semiconductor substrate is exposed to an oxidizing environment, as recited in claims 1 and 26, respectively, are unclear as to whether the intermediate structure has a portion of the semiconductor (cap) layer being a semiconductor oxide, and if so, the location of this new layer with respect to the intermediate structure. It is further unclear whether the semiconductor substrate is exposed to an oxidizing environment, and the resulting structure of such exposure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Art Unit: 2811

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 6-8, 26, 29 and 32, as best understood, are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mandelman (6,518,641).

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Mandelman teaches in figure 1G and related text an intermediate semiconductor device, comprising:

- a semiconductor substrate 10 having a surface formed with a first recessed region S1;

- a first dielectric material 22 formed in the first recessed region;

- a second recessed region S2 formed within the first dielectric material, wherein the second recessed region has walls, a lower surface and a first opening in proximity to the surface; and

- a semiconductor layer 35 formed overlying the first dielectric material 22 having a second opening at least partially over the first opening, wherein at least a portion of the semiconductor layer is configured to convert to a semiconductor oxide that covers the first opening while leaving a void in the second recessed region when the semiconductor substrate is exposed to an oxidizing environment.

Regarding claims 6-8, 29 and 32, Mandelman teaches in figure 1G and related text, wherein the first dielectric material includes deposited silicon dioxide, and

- a layer of material 40 formed overlying the walls of the second recessed region,

- wherein the first dielectric material is recessed below a major surface of the semiconductor substrate;

wherein the first opening S1 is wider than the second opening S2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 9-10, 27 and 33, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandelman (6,518,641).

Regarding claims 5, 10, 27 and 33, Mandelman teaches in figure 1G and related text substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, except stating that the semiconductor (cap) layer is configured to convert to a semiconductor oxide comprises polysilicon. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a polysilicon semiconductor (cap) layer to convert to a semiconductor oxide in order to simplify the processing steps of making the device by using a conventional method of forming a semiconductor oxide.

Regarding claim 9, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recess the first dielectric material below the major surface a distance of about 0.5 microns in prior art's device in order to adjust the characteristics of the device according to the requirements of the application in hand.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 28, the process limitations of “thermally grown silicon dioxide” would not carry patentable weight in this claim drawn to a structure, because distinct structure is not necessarily produced.

Note that a “product by process” claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, *In re Hirao*, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also *In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685; *In re Luck*, 177 USPQ 523; *In re Fessmann*, 180 USPQ 324; *In re Avery*, 186 USPQ 161; *In re Wertheim*, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); and *In re Marosi et al.*, 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a “product by process” claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. Note that the applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5-10, 26-27, 29 and 32-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ori Nadav whose telephone number is 571-272-1660.

Art Unit: 2811

The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on 571-272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'ORI NADAV', is positioned above the printed name.

O.N.
8/7/06

ORI NADAV
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800